THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY.

Annual Report for 1899.

THE

National League for the Protection of the Family.

President.

Hon. NATHANIEL SHIPMAN, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.

Vice-Presidents.

Rt. Rev. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D.D., LL.D., Boston.
Pres. SETH LOW, LL.D., New York.
Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.

Corresponding Secretary.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

Recording Secretary.

Rev. C. H. SPALDING, D.D., Boston.

Treasurer.

WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, Esq., 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston.

Executive Committee.

Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.
Pres. M. H. BUCKHAM, D.D., Burlington, Vt.
Hon. SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.
Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D.D., Cambridge.
Prof. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph.D., Newton Centre.
Rev. JAMES DE NORMANDIE, Roxbury.
Prof. ALBION W. SMALL, Ph.D., Chicago.
Rev. DANIEL MERRIMAN, D.D., Worcester.
Hon. CHARLES C. BURR, Auburndale.
EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston.
FRANK GAYLORD COOK, Esq., Cambridge.
Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

REPORT

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

FOR THE

Year Ending December 31, 1899.

BOSTON:
THE EVERETT PRESS COMPANY, PRINTERS,
74 India Street,
1900.

Special Notices.

The Report this year is so largely taken up with important action regarding Legislation and the Ecclesiastical treatment of Marriage and Divorce that the reader is referred to preceding Reports and "The Review of Fifteen Years" in the Report for 1895 for a more complete survey of the field and work that is being done in it.

Those interested in the work of the Commissioners on Uniform Legislation should write to one of the addresses given on page 10 for a copy of their last report.

Reports for 1890 and later years can be sent to those who apply for them. A small tract of fifteen pages on "The Pastor and the Home;" a paper on the origin and principles of "The Home Department of the Sunday School;" a Report to a National Council of Congregational Churches on "The Family," and a leaflet on "The Aims, Methods, and Results of Our Work" can still be supplied freely to all applicants. Few copies are still in print of other and more important papers.

Special short papers relating to the various branches of our work and the movement it represents are greatly needed and will be published as fast as our means permit. Money for this object and for the general needs of the League is solicited. Inquiries for particulars on this or any other matter connected with the work of the League are invited.

The report of the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, LL.D., Commissioner of Labor, on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and Europe, can be had on application addressed to the Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Associate Annual Membership is invited from those who cannot give large sums. This is freely granted to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of *five dollars* for the year. Such persons become members in full for the time. *If you cannot be a larger contributor, will you not send your request for associate membership, with the fee, and thus share in this work for the Family?* Every one who has profited by the work of the League or who believes in its mission is urgently requested to aid us by a contribution of money. Notice the statement of the Treasurer on page 20.

The Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict, 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, will gratefully acknowledge all contributions sent to him.

Correspondence relating to the work of the League should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, the Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., 113 Hancock Street, Auburndale, Mass. Contributions may also be sent directly to him.

Minutes.

The Twentieth Annual Meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family was held at the Diocesan House, Boston, Jan. 30, 1900, at 2.30 P.M. The first Vice-President, the Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., presided, and opened the session with prayer. Rev. Parris T. Farwell was chosen Recording Secretary *pro tempore*. Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., and Rev. Parris T. Farwell were appointed Committee on Nominations, and reported the following names for officers: —

President, Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D.

Vice-Presidents, Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., President Seth Low, LL.D., President George Harris, D.D., LL.D.

Corresponding Secretary, Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D.

Recording Secretary, Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D.

Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict.

Executive Committee, President George Harris, D.D., President M. H. Buckham, D.D., Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D., Rev. James DeNormandie, Prof. Albion W. Small, Ph.D., Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Hon. Charles C. Burr, Mr. Everett O. Fisk, Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D.

The Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict, made a report, which was accepted and referred to Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., as Auditor.

The Corresponding Secretary then presented his annual report, with additional comments. After remarks upon the report, it was voted that the report be accepted, and ordered printed and distributed at the discretion of Dr. Dike.

The meeting was then adjourned.

PARRIS T. FARWELL,

Recording Secretary, pro tem.

Boston, Mass., Jan. 30, 1900.

Report of Corresponding Secretary.

The year 1899 was of great interest in special subjects relating to the protection of the Family, and also in our work in its behalf. We report the usual advance in State legislation for the years in which most Legislatures hold their biennial session. Measures for greater uniformity in the Divorce Legislation of the United States have been carefully formulated, and published for the criticisms and suggestion of all interested. The interesting features of the Uniform German Divorce Law, which has just taken effect, are presented, and some statements are made regarding the working of the new Family Law of Japan.

An increase of interest on the part of churches and citizens in the need of better protection of the Family is still more important than the specific gains in legislation. A scandalous marriage in the East and the election to Congress of a polygamist in the West were the immediate occasion for much of this; but the larger number of inquiries for aid or information concerning our work and its subjects, coming fr om twenty-seven different States and in much greater numbers than ever before in any one year, the discussions of the newspapers, and the action of religious bodies are clearer evidence and more encouraging than anything else that a healthy and vigorous movement is going on.

The illness of the Secretary for nearly two months early in the year, and later the absence in Europe of an important member of the Finance Committee, prevented that vigorous effort which we hoped to make to replenish our Treasury. Our deficit for the year is $260.04, which is considerably less than in 1898. As will appear later, the debt has increased until it is now more than that which we had in 1887. The latter was paid the next two years.

Partly because of changed conditions, making it best to put more effort into stimulating and shaping practical measures for civil and ecclesiastical action, and partly to reduce expenses to the lowest possible limit until the debt is paid and receipts shall justify larger expenditure, the work the last year or two has been chiefly in correspondence, consultations, and the like, with fewer lectures and addresses. This has reduced the expenses for travelling and printing to very low figures — much too low for the best usefulness. We have been unable

to supply much variety of printed matter, which is sought more than ever, or to do the personal work that is desirable. The postage bill is also less; but this is due to a large quantity of stamps received in exchange for misprinted government envelopes bought the year before, the reduction in the number of Reports printed, and the unusual receipt of postage-stamps in generous sums from applicants for information and printed matter.

THE WAY TO HELP.

Those who may think the results are less than they would like may know that none feel this more keenly than the Corresponding Secretary, who sees opportunities slip for want of means to seize them at the right moment. These and others may be assured that the work will be pushed as fast as the support given it will permit, and others brought into it as soon as possible. Clerical and office aids are greatly needed. The work of collection should be more widely distributed. If every officer, member, contributor, friend, so far as practicable would enlist his church or friends, it would be a relief to the Secretary and a gain in our resources.

A single representative society like that of the League, which stimulates, suggests, gives information from study and experience, and acts as a medium of exchange for all interested, and which tries to do its work so fairly well that it wins and keeps the confidence of the public, is an apparent necessity to the friends of the Family. Not the least valuable testimony to the importance of our League is the number of societies and individuals that have tried to do work in our lines and have voluntarily given up their own measures or organizations because of the force of a public opinion that has made their plans and methods seem less effective than those of the League.

OUR TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY.

This comes another year. An account of the work done and the results secured in the twenty years should be prepared for our next annual meeting in connection with the usual Report for the year. Few, except those who have given careful attention to the history of the movement, are aware of the great change that has been wrought within this period in the public attitude toward the Family as an institution needing protection and development and in practical work in its behalf. Within this period a turn in the tide of loose Divorce Legislation has taken place, the introduction of the study of the Family into most of our higher educational institutions has been accomplished, and the attention of churches, philanthropists, and publicists has turned

to the Home as a social institution needing study and care as much as the Church, the State, the School, or the Industrial Corporation.

It may be that some special observance of this anniversary should be considered. The League is not the work of any one man, but that of a society of members and officers, who are responsible for its conduct, of the one or two hundred who annually give money — often at much sacrifice — to its support, and of a large constituency which profits by its services and rejoices in its successes.

Can not all join in making its twentieth year a reasonably satisfactory conclusion of a period of beginnings? We may then come to see a little more clearly the future path for us.

STATE LEGISLATION.

While some of the State legislation on Marriage and Divorce in 1899 is unimportant, much of it is valuable. As usual, the trend is strongly in the right direction, but with some exceptions. Reports from the States are given in alphabetical order.

ALABAMA authorizes the submission of causes in divorce cases in Courts of Equity for final decree in term time or in vacation after a decree *pro confesso* has been obtained.

ARKANSAS provides that marriage after seduction shall not be a bar to further prosecution of the seducer should he desert the wife without cause.

CONNECTICUT gives permission to the Committee on Divorces in its Legislature to require the appearance of the attorney-general in divorce cases whenever in his opinion justice requires it. The Legislature in Connecticut still having power to grant divorces, further regulation is made for serving notice on the adverse party to a divorce suit when such resides outside the State. Stricter provision is also made for the early return of marriage certificates to the registrar.

FLORIDA. The residence term of two years is not now required in divorce for adultery.

MAINE. The law making intoxication a cause for divorce is amended to include intoxication from the use of opium or other drugs. Divorce suits are to be tried before a jury at the request of either party, or upon the order of the court.

MASSACHUSETTS. No justice of the peace shall solemnize a marriage unless he be also a town clerk, city registrar, clerk of a court, or an assistant of one of these officers, or have been specially designated for this purpose. Of this last class the Governor may appoint one to each five thousand inhabitants for each town or city in the State. Every town may have one such official. These designated

justices of the peace must qualify for this special duty. The aim of this law is to prevent the indiscriminate celebration of marriage by the large numbers of justices of the peace who hold the office for other purposes. It is still far more liberal than European laws on this point.

NEVADA enacts a law requiring a license from all ministers of the gospel before they can celebrate marriages. These licenses must be based on credentials showing their ordination to the ministry and be filed for record with clerks of the District Courts. More careful provision is made for the issue, return, and record of marriage licenses.

NEW HAMPSHIRE. An act of two years ago, but not reported by us at the time, brings non-residents coming into the State to be married under the same regulations regarding notice of intention and record of marriage as citizens of the State.

NEW YORK. A new law amends the code so as to grant trial by jury in cases of divorce for adultery, and gives the co-respondent the right of appearance with costs in case the allegations involving the co-respondent are not proven.

NORTH DAKOTA. After a vigorous effort on the part of clergymen and many other citizens, this State has freed herself from the old territorial laxity by which a residence of ninety days was sufficient to enable parties from other States to use her courts for obtaining divorces quickly. The term is now made one year. The ninety-day term of residence no longer exists anywhere, and the term of six months has within a few years been changed to a year in all but a very few States. We hope to report the complete disappearance of the latter soon. Courts may compel the husband to support the children whether the divorce is granted for the offense of either party.

PENNSYLVANIA. Courts may appoint Masters in Divorce proceedings.

RHODE ISLAND. One Justice of the Supreme Court may be a quorum for the trial of divorce cases.

TENNESSEE forbids the issue of marriage licenses to persons under sixteen years of age, except upon written permission of parents or guardians, which shall be filed at the county clerk's office.

TEXAS makes the celebration of a marriage without a license a misdemeanor. It also regulates marriage after seduction, but fails to adopt the wholesome provision noted above in the legislation of Arkansas.

WISCONSIN. This State enacts substantially the marriage license law of most other States and thus removes a great and growing evil; for Wisconsin had been the resort of large numbers from Chicago

and other places for marriage without license. The new law requires, under penalty for non-compliance, the issue of a marriage license at least five days before the marriage can take place, and for the return and record of the certificate.

UNIFORM LEGISLATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

Thirty-two States now have Commissions for this object. At the last Conference the subject of Uniformity of Divorce Laws took all the time of the session of three days. The following advance report sent out by the Conference is reprinted here with unimportant omissions, "as it fully explains the acts and the intention of the Conference in regard to the proposed acts."

In most of the States creating Commissions this is the first subject the Commissioners are instructed to consider. Its consideration previously had been necessarily deferred until a sufficient number of States was represented to obtain the views and knowledge of Commissioners from all parts of the Union. Of the two bills submitted herewith, it is first to be noticed that the Act on Divorce Procedure is the carefully studied result of the three-days' Conference, after going over the draft reported by the Committee on Divorce. It goes over for final action another year, as is usual with all the recommendations of the Conference, that it may be submitted to the Commissioners who were not present at the meeting. Of course it is subject to change at the next Conference, if found unadapted in expression to the jurisdictions not represented at Buffalo. Otherwise it is put out as a finished bill, embodying the decision of the Conference on that branch of the subject.

It hardly needs saying that this uniform law on Divorce Procedure, if generally adopted, seemed to the Commissioners adapted to prevent in some degree migratory divorces, by which the laws of one State are practically nullified by a temporary residence in another State; to render less easy frauds on the courts; to give the respondent fuller opportunity of defence; and especially to make the final effect of a divorce the same all over the Union.

On the other hand, the proposed bill on the Causes of Divorce has not in any sense been adopted or passed upon by the Commissioners, but is simply the report of the Committee on Divorce, presented by them for consideration, and after a slight discussion, continued over to the next meeting for further action.

The committee reported that the five causes enumerated in the bill are at present the specified existing causes in about forty States. Several other causes referring to conditions at or before marriage are, of course, not enumerated in a bill referring only to causes arising after marriage.

With the exception of "omnibus clauses," such as those allowing divorce for "any reasons satisfactory to the court," or "for any cause defeating the purposes of the marriage relation," this is now the law substantially in

a great majority of the States. The committee believed that these "omnibus clauses" were not only liable to abuse, but gave the court a latitude of discretion unjust to respondents and incompatible with the theory of government by fixed laws. The two States which occupy the anomalous position of recognizing but one cause or no causes for absolute divorce would probably be unaffected by the bill except as their citizens were divorced in other States.

AN ACT TO ESTABLISH A LAW UNIFORM WITH THE LAWS OF OTHER STATES RELATIVE TO DIVORCE PROCEDURE AND DIVORCE FROM THE BOND OF MARRIAGE.

Be it enacted, etc.

SECTION 1. No divorce shall be granted for any cause arising prior to the residence of the petitioner or defendant in this State which was not a ground for divorce in the State where the cause arose.

SECTION 2. No person shall be entitled to a divorce for any cause arising in this State who has not had actual residence in this State for at least one year next before bringing suit for divorce, with a *bona fide* intention of making this State his or her permanent home.

SECTION 3. No person shall be entitled to a divorce for any cause arising out of this State unless the petitioner or defendant shall have resided within this State for at least two years next before bringing suit for divorce, with a *bona fide* intention of making this State his or her permanent home.

SECTION 4. No person shall be entitled to a divorce unless the defendant shall have been personally served with process, if within this State, or with personal notice duly authenticated, if out of this State, or unless the defendant shall have entered an appearance in the case; but if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court that the petitioner does not know the address nor the residence of the defendant, and has not been able to ascertain either, after reasonable and due inquiry and search continued for one year, the court, or judge in vacation, may authorize notice by publication of the pendency of the petition for divorce to be given in manner provided by law.

SECTION 5. No divorce shall be granted solely upon default, nor solely upon admissions by the pleadings, nor except upon trial before the court in open session.

SECTION 6. After divorce either party may marry again; but in cases where notice has been given by publication only, and the defendant has not appeared, no decree for divorce shall become final or operative until six months after trial and decision.

SECTION 7. Wherever the word "divorce" occurs in the act it shall be deemed to mean divorce from the bond of marriage.

AN ACT TO ESTABLISH A LAW UNIFORM WITH THE LAWS OF OTHER STATES RELATIVE TO DIVORCE.

Divorce from the bond of marriage shall be granted for the following causes arising after marriage: adultery, extreme cruelty, habitual drunkenness, or the confirmed habit of intoxication, whether arising from the use of

alcoholic drinks or of drugs; conviction of felony, with sentence of imprisonment to a state prison or penitentiary; and continuous desertion for at least ——— years.

Divorce from the bond of marriage shall not be granted for any other cause arising after marriage.

The Conference also prints a proposed law for the prevention of the solicitation of divorce business by advertisement, similar to that already existing in a few States.

It seems to your Secretary, whose suggestions have been repeatedly invited by leading members of the Commissions, that every encouragement consistent with convictions of duty should be given to this work. While many of us, as well as some of the Commissioners, would desire more than has been attempted so far, the advantages offered would seem to call for the adoption of the most, if not all, the positive recommendations of the plan. As the Commissioners point out, even the adoption of the five causes of divorce by other States could be so guarded that any State would be left free to restrict its own people to a smaller number. The first section of the other general act would help protect the stricter State. We must remember that grave as the evils of our conflicting Marriage and Divorce Laws are, cases affected by them are after all a small per cent of the whole number granted. Nor should we forget that here in the work of the Commissions is a practicable plan, whether it is to be the final one or not, and that uniformity under constitutional amendment is extremely slow, difficult, and of doubtful efficacy in decreasing divorces.

The Commissioners will gladly welcome any criticisms or suggestions. These, or requests for their valuable Reports, should be sent to the President, Hon. Lyman D. Brewster, Danbury, Ct., or to the Secretary, Albert E. Henschel, Esq., 214 Broadway, New York.

UNIFORM DIVORCE LAW IN GERMANY.

Our Report for 1893 described the Uniform Marriage Law of the German Empire as intended to be a part ultimately of a uniform system of Family Law. This intention is now fulfilled in a Uniform Divorce Law for the entire Empire, which took effect Jan. 1, 1900. While the varied interests of the German States and religions make this measure a difficult one, the Imperial policy and their method of enlisting the ablest jurists in such work as this has brought about the present solution of the problem. A brief statement of the results, of which I have seen little account in English, will be useful here.

Instead of the numerous causes for divorce which have prevailed in most German States, all divorces now come under four heads

only. First, for the adultery, bigamy, or unnatural immorality of either party. But agreement of either to the cause prevents suit for divorce by that one. Second, attempt by either husband or wife on the life of the other. Third, maliciously wilful desertion by either. Refusal of the husband to support his wife comes under this head. Fourth, continued violation of marriage vows or faithless or immoral behavior so complete as to violate the proprieties of marriage in a way that the innocent party can no longer suffer a continuance of the marriage. Various safeguards are provided. The suit must be brought within six months of the time the cause for divorce takes place. No suit can be brought after condonation of the offence.

A NOVEL PROTECTION AGAINST DIVORCE FOR DESERTION.

The special rule regarding divorce for desertion is noteworthy. Before a suit on the ground of desertion can be brought, a special preliminary suit for the re-establishment of marital relations must be prosecuted to a decision; and even then the suit for divorce on the established fact of desertion cannot be tried until the defendant has failed for one year to comply with the decision of the court in the preliminary case ordering a return to domestic duties. Here is a novel way of checking the abuse of divorce through desertion, which in this country is by far the most frequently misused of all our statutory grounds for divorce. The courts are also required in their decisions to note the facts of guilt in both parties whenever both are in fault. The party guilty of adultery and the accomplice are both liable to imprisonment from one day to six months.

The fourth ground for divorce would in this country be greatly abused; but with only twenty-eight courts of a high order in as many judicial districts for the entire Empire, judging by the past experience of those German States where much more lax provisions have been in existence for a long time, the risk of abuse there is much less than it would be in this country. As hitherto, the fact and the reason for the dissolution of all marriages, whether by divorce or death, must be entered on the margin of the original record of the marriage. This makes bigamous marriages almost impossible.

The practical working of this law will be worthy of careful study; for Germany, I believe, is the first country to attempt both uniformity and the reduction of the legal grounds for divorce at the same time.

JAPAN.

The Code of Family Law in Japan has recently gone into effect. As it is a sudden and radical change from the very old system of marriage and divorce without legal control, it meets many difficulties and must work its way slowly. Adoption — of which adults are the chief subjects, as in early Roman Law, in order to preserve a family from extinction — is common, but probably decreasing. Concubinage, Dr. De Forrest reports, though having a rather limited but honorable place, is a great evil; but a vigorous movement against it has begun within the last year or two. "The framers of the new Family Law, though themselves to some extent having mixed families, refused to have the word 'concubine' in the new laws." The same authority says that Mr. Fukuzama, an able and influential writer, is vigorously attacking concubinage and the *geisha* system of dancing-girls as the main root of the social evil. Divorce by mutual consent is still allowed. The new legal causes are the four or five most common in Western nations, and the law may be expected to increase in efficacy.

RECENT MOVEMENTS IN VARIOUS STATES.

The efforts at improvement of the Marriage or Divorce Laws of a State generally take two or three years for success, though sometimes legislation is secured in a single year. The movement often first appears in inquiries for information. We reported a year ago these signs of activity in the interests of better legislation in North Dakota, Indiana, Michigan, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Nothing seems to have come of two of these; but our report on the legislation of the year shows marked success in North Dakota and Wisconsin. The people of South Dakota also prevented the loss of the gains they had made. The movement in Missouri, though ably led and well supported, failed. One of the leading and most highly respected clergymen of the State writes of it to the League as follows: "The reform moves slowly, but it is bound to come, and with it substantially uniform laws throughout the Union. When that consummation is at last reached the country will owe you a heavy debt of gratitude, to say the least of it. The main task is to secure a public opinion pure and strong enough to support the best law when we get it."

CALIFORNIA.

Our correspondence this year indicates special interest in legal reform in California and the District of Columbia, and some in

Texas and other States. The clergy in Southern California have been looking into their local conditions, which they find alarming. One of them says the records of the courts of Los Angeles County show that 396 divorces were granted in 1898 to 1,380 marriages, a rate that was sustained in the first three months of 1899, the last date for which the figures are given. Either the marriages were very imperfectly reported or the marriage rate is as dangerously low as the divorce rate is alarmingly high. If so, there is need of careful attention to this subject also; for in 1890 the population of the county was 101,454, and it is now probably much greater. But in any case the divorce rate is at an unusual height. It would be important to know if any considerable part of these divorces are granted to non-residents; for California changed the term of required residence from six months to a year, and prohibited the solicitation of divorce business by advertisement.

California stands in a peculiar position in relation to the Family from her early history, whose conditions have deeply affected her domestic life. Happily there is reason to believe that some of her own citizens are addressing themselves with great earnestness to this problem. For several years the department of Social and Political Science in the Leland Stanford University has been giving a great deal of thorough study to the various aspects of the problem, and this work will tell in powerful ways upon the entire State. The head of the department is one of the most thorough students of the Family in this country. It is not unlikely that the State University and other institutions are also doing good work in the same direction; for the scientific pursuits of institutions in the West are being especially directed to local social problems.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

In the District of Columbia an effort is now made to make illegal the granting of divorce proper for all reasons except adultery, and to require the entrance of the district attorney in every case for the defence in order to prevent collusion. There are now four grounds for divorce in the District, besides the usual provisions for nullity and voidance of marriages in certain cases. Whether this high standard can be urged successfully, especially at this time, when uniformity is under consideration, is open to question.

The object of the provision for a defence of the interests of the State is most worthy in itself; but for various reasons it does not seem so far to accomplish much in this country where it has hitherto been adopted. Still it may be worthy of experiment at the Capital.

The judges of the local courts are reported as greatly deploring the present condition of things and desiring better statutes. It is to be hoped that here and elsewhere local efforts at legal reform, which are always best, should be made with full knowledge of the general movement and experience of others, and be under the control of judicious leaders. Many failures have met earnest reformers for the lack of care at this point.

More attention should be given to the administration of the laws as they stand in the statute-books. European countries generally are at an advantage over us in this respect. Their courts are few, their judges often specially trained for their duties, and safeguards are thrown about their procedure. In this way the statutory causes are often quite as liberal as those among us, without the glaring mischiefs common in this country. The German method of dealing with desertion, already described, is in point here. Probably our people would find it foreign to their ideas of divorce procedure.

MORMON POLYGAMY.

This subject is attracting unusual attention. Important as the expulsion of a polygamous member from Utah is, we have been more concerned for other things connected with this case. The proposed Anti-Polygamy amendment of the Constitution of the United States has seemed to us a much more difficult question than some of its advocates have thought. We have called attention to some of the difficulties that stand in the way of its adoption, but without venturing the opinion that they are decisive. Some of these are: the general reluctance to amend the Constitution in any direction; the slow process by which this can be done; the possible embarrassment of the States from the surrender of their own control over polygamy, or from a joint jurisdiction with the Federal Courts; and the necessity of depending for convictions on the local juries in Utah and other polygamous States. The necessity before us may compel action that seems very difficult or otherwise undesirable; but let us take in the whole situation and not act rashly.

THE MORE IMPORTANT TASK.

We have not neglected the broader bearings of the subject. Mormon polygamy is not a wholly isolated evil born and nourished on Western soil, which we can attack at long range, and as something entirely foreign to the social life of the rest of the country. Its founders and many of its early followers were of Eastern, even New England, origin. They came from homes and communities having

those defects which have supplied our divorces, our licentiousness, and our individualism in thinking upon moral and social topics. It may be doubted if any other country than our own could have supplied all the conditions necessary to the invention and development of Mormonism and its domestic system. Mormon polygamy, unlike that of the East, which is usually simple bigamy, flaunts itself in the face of the nation. So does Divorce. Society turns its back on the Mormon polygamist, but is careful not to inquire too closely into the antecedents of the divorced. Yet every thoughtful person and every lover of his country must see that the localized assault upon the Family in Utah and vicinity is much less dangerous than the insidious evils that keep our Divorce Courts and police busy. Much as we need legislation, we need education and reformation far more. Nor is it even these dissolutions of the Family bond that should trouble us so much as the general neglect to make the Home the centre of more of the best efforts we put forth. A torpid Home is the forerunner of an immoral one. If the present agitation of the subject of polygamy in Utah is attended with an equally sincere and vigorous effort to deal with our own part of the common evil, we shall escape the guilt of hypocrisy and gain power in both directions. We have continually called attention to this phase of the subject, and had the hearty approval of thoughtful people in doing so. That defect in the efforts of the Church at reform, which leads her people to look to Congress and State Legislatures for work which needs doing within the field of the Church itself as well as in the State, has been pointed out by us more plainly than ever. Good results begin to appear.

THE CHANGING ATTITUDE OF CHURCHES.

Some of the Christian bodies of the country have always seen that they should take at least as much interest in the religious as in the legal aspects of marriage and divorce. Others are now coming to the same conclusion. This is one of the most hopeful things of the year. Our last Report called particular attention to the opportunity churches have of checking migration for improper marriages by the exercise of a principle of comity like that which the Commissions on Uniformity propose for adoption by the States, to which reference is made in this Report.

A most unfortunate marriage in Connecticut of parties from New York directed public attention to the subject. Both the religious press and the daily newspapers were outspoken and unanimous in their opinion of the mischief that had been done. We took care to encourage this expression and direct thought to the evil and the need of some

positive action. The General Association of Connecticut (Congregational ministers) promptly took up the subject. Their resolutions urged "the greatest caution before consenting in the name of religion to officiate at the marriage of any person who has been divorced, and that such consent should never be given in case of the guilty party divorced for adultery, nor of any other divorced person without careful examination leading to a full and exact knowledge of the facts. Comity, both between States and churches, should be respected. Our ministers should decline to marry parties who are forbidden to marry by a decree of courts in other States, or by the rules of other Christian bodies with which they are connected." More direct attention by the Church to the Family and the Home was also urged.

The Baptists of Connecticut and Massachusetts took even more strict position regarding the marriage of divorced persons by their ministers. About the same time Bishop Potter of New York, Bishop Doane of Albany, Bishop Dudley of Kentucky, and perhaps one or two other Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church devoted a large part of their annual Diocesan addresses to the subject. The General Synod of the Reformed Church adopted resolutions regarding Marriage and Divorce Laws, but I do not learn that its action referred at all to any duties of the Church itself to the people. But the Church generally thus takes a position that will command the respect of the State and make it more willing to grant requests for better legislation.

Among the other opportunities used was that of a request for an article in the *Homiletical Review* for October, 1899, on "The Present Aspects of the Divorce Question." This has called out many inquiries from widely separated parts of the country for further information concerning the League and its work. Bishop Potter's article in the *North American* for the same month has some vigorous thought regarding the conditions that weaken the Family, which he sees is the real subject before us.

ANOTHER DIRECTION OF CHURCH INTEREST.

Some of the leading churches are turning their attention in an unusual degree to the religious training of children. Of late there has been much interest in various plans for the catechetical instruction and other similar training of the young. This seems likely to be a subject of growing interest. Already churches are introducing it and catechisms are coming out for the purpose where none have existed before. These, however, are largely on old-fashioned lines.

The special significance of this movement for us is that it will inevitably compel attention to the religious training of the children in

its entirety, and this will force the Home upon our attention and compel a broad treatment of the whole subject. The adding of one new device after another for the religious training of children, with small regard for proportion and adjustment in order to secure a symmetrical and efficient system, cannot go much farther in some of our churches. In many of them the children are cared for by the use of Sunday schools, special societies for them, Mothers' Associations, children's sermons, and the Home, each working separately in its own way in many instances. But the correlation of this work is too often wholly neglected, and its adjustment to the principles of pedagogy and to the work of the public school is rarely considered.

READJUSTMENT.

As our Reports of recent years have shown, we are keenly alive to the probability that the adjustment of the Home to the educational institutions of the Church and the State, carrying with it the task of securing a better relation of the Sunday schools and the public schools to each other, is one of the most important of the educational problems of the present time. In principle it is only another step, but a long one, in the correlation of educational work that has been going on in the schools, colleges, and libraries. The growing need of reducing to better order the numerous societies and other agencies that are so thickly sown in some of our churches as to choke each other's growth will very likely hasten this other readjustment. The sense of the comparative suppression of the Home in all religious and educational work is steadily growing and finding voice. The probable necessity of reorganizing many of our local churches on a more scientific basis in the early future will bring the whole subject of the place of the Family in church work to the front. The present multiplicity of agencies working with little co-ordination and overlapping each other, or leaving wide gaps between, threatens to scatter the power of the Church.

IN THE LARGER SOCIAL MOVEMENT.

There is no space left for extended report this year on the attention now given to the place the Home must hold in the political, industrial, and other social interests of the times. Our readers are referred to our three former Reports for what has been said and done on these subjects. But it may be noted here that the tendency towards larger and larger social combination, either in actual form or in influence, which is going on in our country, has a most serious effect upon the two most fundamental types of the institutions of

Human Society. One of these two is the primary social organization, the Family; or, to use the more inclusive term, the Home. The other is the secondary organization, the Community. The one is the association growing out of the relation of sex. The other is an organized collection of individuals acting together for some common purpose, whether of religion, education, industry, or political order. The Home has all these functions within itself. This was true also of the Community in certain early stages of civilization. Now the Community has differentiated, and we have local churches, schools, industries, towns. But all these are communal in structure and function; and within a short period the great movement towards larger combinations, either in definite form or real power, has gone on with astonishing rapidity. Power of every kind is concentrating in larger and larger bodies. The smaller are being exploited where they are not destroyed by the larger.

What, then, is to be the future of the two fundamental and structural forms, the domestic and the communal? We formerly pointed to the single or local church, to the neighborhood school, to the local industry, and to the town meeting of New England and other sections, or their like elsewhere, as being in the past the source and bulwark of our political and social Democracy. Must they yield their place? Can Society reduce the functions of these two types — the Family and Communal group — to a lower degree still and be safe? Or is there to be readjustment and renewed reliance upon them? How far and in what ways should we call upon the Home and the Association of Individuals in purely democratic organizations, or those essentially such, to be the great mediating institutions between the individual and the enormously large corporations of all social kinds that are at the other extreme of society? Is exploitation of the Home by other institutions safe? Can we permit with impunity the exploitation of all local institutions by the larger to go on without serious attention? May not the value and very existence of the larger in the usefulness many of us freely concede that they have be dependent on the more vigorous care of the smaller and more fundamental? Surely the problems of the Home are, as never before, the problems of the Nation itself.

STATISTICS.

It would seem that the time is soon coming when another collection of statistics of marriage and divorce should be made. The Report of the Department of Labor closed its figures with the year 1886. Only eight or ten States are doing this work for themselves.

By the time the necessary legislation can be secured and the work planned fifteen years more can be covered. Hardly any line of inquiry can be more useful than that which throws light on the formation and dissolution of the Family. We hope to push this work soon, and now call the attention of our readers to the duty of securing a good system of vital statistics, including births and deaths, marriages and divorces, in their several States. The system of Massachusetts or Michigan is a good one unless the addition of other details can be secured without danger of imperilling the measure.

SOME IMMEDIATE NEEDS.

The call for our Reports and special papers the past year has been larger than ever. But most of the special papers and some of the Reports are now out of print. One or two should be reprinted with little change. Others should be rewritten, and some new papers prepared and put in circulation. We have little use for the sensational or even the conventional treatment of our subjects. But experience shows that our special papers are widely read, that they stimulate further study, and often lead to important action. Professors of social science, ethics, and pastoral work, and of late teachers in Normal Schools, besides many others, make use of our literature.

Money is needed for this work of publication and for the general prosecution of the work, in addition to that needed for the ordinary expenses and to pay the debt. We are grateful to those who have always been ready to support the League with contributions of money and have refused to let the appeals for other worthy and needy objects stand in the way of their aid to this society, which is the only one wholly devoted to the Family.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. DIKE,

Corresponding Secretary.

Treasurer's Report.

WM. G. BENEDICT, *Treasurer*,
In account with the National League for the Protection of the Family.

DR.		CR.	
Dec. 31, 1899.		Dec. 31, 1899.	
To Receipts from Contributions for the year 1899, as per details in Cash Book	$2,107 67	By Disbursements for the year 1899, as per Cash Book:	
		General Expenses,—	
		Travelling	$136 43
		Postage	35 28
		Advertising, Express, etc., . . .	15 65
		Printing	118 15
		Stationery	12 20
		Rent	50 00
		Paid on Account of Salary of Secretary	1,739 96
	$2,107 67		$2,107 67
		MEMORANDA.	
		General Expenses for 1899 .	$367 71
		Salary of Secretary	2,000 00
			$2,367 71
		Receipts for 1899	2,107 67
		Deficiency	$260 04
		Previous Deficiency .	1,236 41
		Total Deficiency .	$1,496 45

Account audited and found correct, Jan. 31, 1900.
FRANK GAYLORD COOK.

CONTRIBUTIONS.

Jan.	2.	Rev. W. H. Moore, Hartford, Conn.	$3 00
	4.	President Seth Low, LL.D., New York	50 00
	7.	Christ Church, Fitchburg	18 52

Jan. 7.	Col. Jacob L. Greene, Hartford, Conn.	$35 00
7.	Rev. S. P. Leeds, D.D., Hanover, N. H.	5 00
7.	From sale of "special paper"	4 50
10.	Rev. H. C. Hovey, D.D., Newburyport	1 00
16.	Hon. Charles C. Burr, Auburndale	40 00
18.	Mrs. Theodore D. Woolsey, New Haven, Conn.	50 00
18.	Frank L. Palmer, New London, Conn.	5 00
18.	Hon. Moses Giddings, Bangor, Me.	5 00
28.	State Street Congregational Church, Portland, Me.	25 00
31.	Old South Church, Boston	25 00
	Received in January	$267 02
Feb. 3.	Sunday School, Second Congregational Church, Norwich, Conn.	$3 30
11.	Hon. William E. Dodge, New York	100 00
11.	Rev. W. Spooner Smith, Auburndale	10 00
18.	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence, R. I.	10 00
20.	James C. Braman, Auburndale	10 00
20.	Rev. C. W. Huntington, Lowell	5 00
21.	Prof. Henry W. Farnam, New Haven, Conn.	25 00
21.	Rev. Walter Glynne, Summit, N. J.	1 00
21.	William G. Benedict, Boston	15 00
21.	Robert H. Gardiner, Chestnut Hill	5 00
23.	George Burnham, Philadelphia, Pa.	25 00
27.	Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.	25 00
27.	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston	5 00
27.	Wingate P. Sargent, Melrose	5 00
28.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston	25 00
28.	Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D., Newton Centre	5 00
	Received in February	$274 30
Mar. 2.	Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y.	$10 00
3.	Rev. W. P. Alcott, Boxford	2 00
3.	Henry G. Marquand, New York	5 00
3.	Charles E. Ranlett, Auburndale	5 00
4.	George Falkner, M.D., Jamaica Plain	10 00
4.	The Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Burlington, Vt.	5 00
4.	Rev. George B. Johnson, Burlington, Vt.	5 00
6.	St. Ann's Church Missionary Society, Brooklyn, N. Y.	5 00
6.	Rev. Daniel L. Furber, D.D., Newton Centre	2 00
6.	President Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Washington, D. C.	10 00
6.	The Very Rev. E. A. Hoffman, D.D., LL.D., New York	25 00
7.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester	5 00
7.	"L. H. W.," Boston	10 00
7.	Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith, D.D., Washington, D. C.	15 00
8.	Robert C. Ogden, New York	25 00

Mar. 8.	Prof. E. Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover	$5 00	
8.	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale	10 00	
8.	Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D.D., St. Louis, Mo.	5 00	
16.	Rev. William Prall, D.D., Detroit, Mich.	3 00	
16.	Rev. A. P. Grint, Ph.D., New London, Conn.	2 00	
17.	St. Bartholomew's Church, New York (in part)	50 00	
24.	Rev. William S. Hubbell, D.D., New York	5 00	
24.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester	50 00	
28.	Prof. C. R. Henderson, D.D., Chicago, Ill.	2 00	
28.	Morris K. Jesup, New York	10 00	
28.	Prof. Dean A. Walker, Ph.D., Aurora, N. Y.	5 00	
29.	All Saints' Church, Worcester	10 00	
	Received in March		$296 00
April 3.	President Daniel C. Gilman, LL.D., Baltimore, Md.	$5 00	
3.	Prof. Lewis O. Brastow, D.D., New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
3.	Rev. A. B. Bassett, Ware	5 00	
5.	Rt. Rev. Leighton Coleman, D.D., LL.D., Wilmington, Del.	3 00	
8.	Prof. Walter F. Willcox, Ph.D., Ithaca, N. Y.	5 00	
18.	Rev. W. H. Davis, D.D., Newton	5 00	
20.	Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham	10 00	
22.	Rev. E. M. Parker, Concord, N. H.	5 00	
25.	C. W. Wilder, Newton	10 00	
25.	James Schouler, Boston	5 00	
26.	William H. Eaton, Lee	5 00	
30.	Presbyterian Churches, Bloomfield, N. J.	28 14	
	Received in April		$91 14
May 2.	Rev. Henry Clay Trumbull, D.D., LL.D., Philadelphia	$5 00	
2.	Rev. S. W. Dana, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.	5 00	
2.	Stuart Wood, Philadelphia, Pa.	10 00	
2.	W. S. Price, Philadelphia, Pa.	5 00	
8.	Rev. A. M. Merwin, Pasadena, Cal.	3 00	
20.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, Boston	10 00	
25.	Christ Church, Hartford, Conn.	10 00	
25.	W. P. Henzy, Philadelphia, Pa.	40 00	
30.	"A Friend"	1 00	
31.	George B. Knapp, Auburndale	10 00	
31.	Rev. Arthur Lawrence, D.D., Stockbridge	25 00	
	Received in May		$124 00
June 2.	Rev. Francis Goodwin, Hartford, Conn.	$20 00	
10.	George Ripley, Andover	10 00	
13.	St. Ann's Church, Lowell	25 00	
20.	Messrs. Funk and Wagnalls, New York	10 00	
	Received in June		$ 65 00

July 10.	Rev. Charles M. Southgate, Auburndale	$5 00	
11.	St. John's Church, Stamford, Conn.	26 92	
15.	Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D., D.C.L., New York	25 00	
	Received in July		$ 56 92
Aug. 25.	Prof. Walter B. Bradley, Ph.D., Middletown, Conn.		$5 00
Sept. 15.	Rev. John W. Buckham, Salem		$3 00
Oct. 2.	Rev. Everett E. Lewis, Haddam, Conn.	$4 00	
7.	Rev. Horace Dutton, Auburndale	5 00	
7.	"A Friend," Auburndale	5 00	
10.	Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D., Cambridge	10 00	
17.	Hon. Frederick J. Kingsbury, LL.D., Waterbury, Conn.	25 00	
17.	Rev. John G. Davenport, D.D., Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
17.	Mrs. Gilman C. Hill, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
17.	Henry C. Wade, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
17.	"A Friend," Waterbury, Conn.	2 00	
24.	Grace Church, Lawrence	21 29	
26.	Prof. Waldo S. Pratt, Hartford, Conn.	5 00	
27.	Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00	
30.	St. Bartholomew's Church, New York (additional)	50 00	
31.	Sunday School, Church of the Good Shepherd, Hartford, Conn.	5 00	
	Received in October		$202 29
Nov. 4.	Rev. James W. Cooper, D.D., New Britain, Conn.	$5 00	
7.	Hon. Lyman D. Brewster, Danbury, Conn.	5 00	
7.	Rufus B. Fowler, Worcester	5 00	
7.	President G. Stanley Hall, LL.D., Worcester	5 00	
11.	Rt. Rev. Chauncey Brewster, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	5 00	
14.	Mrs. J. S. Brigham, Worcester	10 00	
15.	Prof. John W. Conklin, Springfield	2 00	
17.	J. H. W., New York	20 00	
17.	Hon. Robert D. Benedict, New York	10 00	
17.	Rev. Henry Blanchard, D.D., Portland, Me.	5 00	
17.	First Congregational Church, New Britain, Conn.	3 00	
24.	Rev. John N. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10 00	
27.	Edwin Ginn, Winchester	10 00	
27.	William B. Herrick, Auburndale	10 00	
27.	Prof. John Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover	5 00	
28.	Mrs. William E. Dodge, Sr., New York	10 00	
28.	Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, New York	20 00	
28.	Rev. A. W. Hazen, D.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
28.	"A Friend," Essex Junction, Vt.	1 00	
	Received in November		$146 00
Dec. 2.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	$50 00	
8.	Arthur Reed Kimball, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
11.	Prof. W. W. Atwater, Ph.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	

Dec. 12.	South Evangelical Church, West Roxbury	$5 00
13.	Rev. Parris T. Farwell, Wellesley Hills	5 00
14.	Coolidge S. Roberts, Cambridge	20 00
14.	Hon. Edward L. Pickard, Auburndale	10 00
14.	A. C. Tenney, Chelsea	2 00
14.	Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge	5 00
15.	E. P. Dutton, New York	10 00
15.	"A Vermont Lady"	50 00
15.	Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale	2 00
15.	W. W. Lockwood, Detroit, Mich.	5 00
15.	Rev. Theodore T. Munger, D.D., New Haven, Conn.	5 00
16.	Charles Dudley Warner, Hartford, Conn.	10 00
16.	Everett O. Fisk, Boston	5 00
18.	Rev. W. W. Atterbury, D.D., New York	5 00
18.	Asylum Hill Congregational Church, Hartford, Conn.	25 00
18.	E. R. Brown, Dover, N. H.	5 00
19.	Miss Mary I. Lockwood, New London, Conn.	5 00
19.	John Nicholas Brown, Providence, R. I.	25 00
21.	President George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst	15 00
21.	Rev. James W. Bixler, New London, Conn.	5 00
21.	Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D.D., New York	5 00
21.	Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston	5 00
21.	St. John's Church, Providence, R. I.	25 00
22.	Rev. John Brown, D.D., New York	5 00
23.	Francis B. Sears, Boston	5 00
23.	J. Howard Nichols, Newton	5 00
23.	Hon. W. P. Ellison, Newton	10 00
25.	Mrs. Daniel Merriman, Worcester	10 00
25.	Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C.	5 00
26.	"A Friend"	100 00
26.	Centre Congregational Church, Meriden, Conn.	5 00
26.	Rev. George M. Adams, D.D., Auburndale	5 00
28.	Miss M. Josephine Allen, Boston	5 00
28.	L. W. Carroll, Norwich, Conn.	2 00
28.	Rev. S. L. Howe, D.D., Norwich, Conn.	5 00
28.	"A Member" Eliot Church, Newton	5 00
29.	Robert Coit, New London, Conn.	10 00
29.	Francis Lynde Stetson, New York	25 00
30.	Charles A. Peabody, M.D., Worcester	5 00
30.	Rev. Lewellyn Pratt, D.D., Norwich, Conn.	10 00
30.	Gen. William A. Aiken, Norwich, Conn.	5 00
30.	First Congregational Church, Meriden, Conn.	25 00
30.	Prof. A. W. Small, Ph.D., Chicago, Ill.	5 00
30.	John Gilchrist, Boston	1 00
30.	Rev. Francis E. Clark, D.D., Auburndale	5 00
30.	Prof. William North Rice, Ph.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00
	Received in December	$577 00

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family.

ARTICLE I. This Association shall be called the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY.

ART. II. Its object shall be, through the improvement of public sentiment and legislation, to protect the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing laws relating to Marriage and Divorce, and to secure its proper efficiency as a moral and social life. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims or such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number:

ART. IV. The officers of this Society shall be a President, not more than two Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices, to be elected at the annual meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The League shall hold its Annual Meeting on the third Wednesday in [illegible] unless otherwise ordered by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and at such time and place as shall be indicated in the call of the Committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given at the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of [illegible] of the members present.

ART. VII. Communications concerning the work of the League and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, D.D., Adrian, Mich.

Contributions should be sent to the Treasurer, Mr. WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, [illegible], Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST.

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY, a corporation created by the Laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successors or assigns, the sum of ..... dollars, the principal [illegible] to be [illegible] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said [illegible] was [illegible].